

REMARKS

This application is under final rejection. Applicant has presented arguments herein below that Applicant believes should render the claims allowable. In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicant's arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the amendment to clarify issues upon appeal.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated February 8, 2006. Claims 1-8 are pending. Claims 1-8 are rejected. Claim 7 has been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Accordingly, claims 1-8 remain pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al US Patent 6490173 in view of Ishikawa US Patent 4697044.

Applicant agrees with the examiner that “Perkins et al does not expressly teach said printed circuit board having a part provided with at least one of the said spaced holes and extending through the outer side wall”. The examiner cites Ishikawa as teaching this limitation. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Ishikawa teaches a frame (11) that receives a circuit board (14). The circuit board (14) is supported by positioning projections (11a) formed at the side panels and edge

portions of the board and fixedly connecting them to an inner surface of the frame (11) through solder (Column 2, lines 40-44).

In contrast, with the present invention, it is the frame, not the printed circuit board, which has projections (leg sections). The printed circuit board instead has a plurality of spaced holes, where the leg sections extends through the holes.

In addition, Ishikawa discloses that the projections (11a) are soldered to the *inner surface* of the board (14). In contrast, with the present invention, the leg sections extend *through* the holes in the board. That the projections (11a) in Ishikawa does not extend through the holes is supported by Figures 5 and 6 of Ishikawa.

Due to the above structural differences, the casing in Ishikawa would not be grounded in the same manner as the device of the present invention. The casing in Ishikawa is thus not analogous to the device of the present invention.

Therefore, Perkins in view of Ishikawa does not teach or suggest a printed circuit board having a plurality of spaced holes, said leg sections extending through respective holes and being soldered to said printed circuit board so as to couple said frame to said printed circuit board, said printed circuit board having a part provided with at least one spaced holes and extending through said outer side wall, in combination with the other elements of the present invention, as recited in independent claim 1.

Claim 2-6 each depend upon claim 1. Applicant submits they each are patentable when read in combination with independent claim 1.

Based on all of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that § 103(a) rejection to claims 1-6 be withdrawn and an indication of allowance be made.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claim 7 and 8 are being rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Ishikawa, US Patent 4697044.

In order to anticipate an invention under 35 USC 102(b), the cited reference must contain all the limitations contained in a particular claim that the reference is deemed to anticipate.

Applicant's arguments concerning Ishikawa as applied to claims 1-6 apply to claims 7-8 with equal force. For the sake of brevity, these arguments will not be repeated here.

Therefore, Ishikawa does not teach or suggest a printed circuit board having a plurality of spaced peripheral extensions, said side wall of said frame and said peripheral extensions comprising respective formations engaging one another upon coupling said frame to said printed circuit board, wherein the peripheral extensions extend through the side wall, in combination with the other elements of the present invention, as recited in amended independent claim 7.

Claim 8 is dependant from claim 7. Applicant submits it is patentable when read in combination with independent claim 7.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-8 are patentable over the cited references. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and does not appear to be any more relevant than the applied references.

Applicant respectfully requests a one-month extension of time to file this response. The fee of \$120 is enclosed.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,


Michele Liu
Reg. No. 44,875

Date: June 8, 2006

(408) 233-1360

PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICA CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
1109 McKay Drive, M/S-41SJ
San Jose, CA 95131